

Diagnostic accuracy of whole-body MRI versus standard imaging pathways for metastatic disease in newly diagnosed non-small-cell lung cancer

Streamline investigators; Taylor, Stuart A; Mallett, Susan; Ball, Simon; Beare, Sandy; Bhatnagar, Gauraang; Bhowmik, Angshu; Boavida, Peter; Bridgewater, John A; Clarke, Caroline S; Duggan, Marian; Ellis, Steve; Glynne-Jones, Robert; Goh, Vicky; Groves, Ashley M; Hameeduddin, Ayshea; Janes, Sam M; Johnston, Edward W; Koh, Dow-Mu; Lock, Sara

DOI:

[10.1016/S2213-2600\(19\)30090-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(19)30090-6)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution (CC BY)

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Streamline investigators, Taylor, SA, Mallett, S, Ball, S, Beare, S, Bhatnagar, G, Bhowmik, A, Boavida, P, Bridgewater, JA, Clarke, CS, Duggan, M, Ellis, S, Glynne-Jones, R, Goh, V, Groves, AM, Hameeduddin, A, Janes, SM, Johnston, EW, Koh, D-M, Lock, S, Miles, A, Morris, S, Morton, A, Navani, N, Oliver, A, O'Shaughnessy, T, Padhani, AR, Prezzi, D, Punwani, S, Quinn, L, Rafiee, H, Reczko, K, Rockall, AG, Russell, P, Sidhu, HS, Strickland, N, Tarver, K, Teague, J & Halligan, S 2019, 'Diagnostic accuracy of whole-body MRI versus standard imaging pathways for metastatic disease in newly diagnosed non-small-cell lung cancer: the prospective Streamline L trial', *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 523-532.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(19\)30090-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(19)30090-6)

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Download date: 04. May. 2023

Diagnostic accuracy of whole-body MRI versus standard imaging pathways for metastatic disease in newly diagnosed non-small-cell lung cancer: the prospective Streamline L trial

Stuart A Taylor, Sue Mallett, Simon Ball, Sandy Beare, Gaurang Bhatnagar, Angshu Bhowmik, Peter Boavida, John Bridgewater, Caroline S Clarke, Marian Duggan, Steve Ellis, Robert Glynn-Jones, Vicky Goh, Ashley M Groves, Ayshea Hameeduddin, Sam M Janes, Edward W Johnston, Dow-Mu Koh, Sara Lock, Anne Miles, Stephen Morris, Alison Morton, Neal Navani, Alfred Oliver, Terry O'Shaughnessy, Anwar R Padhani, David Prezzi, Shonit Punwani, Laura Quinn, Hameed Rafiee, Krystyna Reczko, Andrea G Rockall, Peter Russell, Harbir S Sidhu, Nicola Strickland, Kathryn Tarver, Jonathan Teague, Steve Halligan, on behalf of the Streamline investigators*



Summary

Background Whole-body magnetic resonance imaging (WB-MRI) could be an alternative to multi-modality staging of non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC), but its diagnostic accuracy, effect on staging times, number of tests needed, cost, and effect on treatment decisions are unknown. We aimed to prospectively compare the diagnostic accuracy and efficiency of WB-MRI-based staging pathways with standard pathways in NSCLC.

Methods The Streamline L trial was a prospective, multicentre trial done in 16 hospitals in England. Eligible patients were 18 years or older, with newly diagnosed NSCLC that was potentially radically treatable on diagnostic chest CT (defined as stage IIb or less). Exclusion criteria were severe systemic disease, pregnancy, contraindications to MRI, or histologies other than NSCLC. Patients underwent WB-MRI, the result of which was withheld until standard staging investigations were complete and the first treatment decision made. The multidisciplinary team recorded its treatment decision based on standard investigations, then on the WB-MRI staging pathway (WB-MRI plus additional tests generated), and finally on all tests. The primary outcome was difference in per-patient sensitivity for metastases between standard and WB-MRI staging pathways against a consensus reference standard at 12 months, in the per-protocol population. Secondary outcomes were difference in per-patient specificity for metastatic disease detection between standard and WB-MRI staging pathways, differences in treatment decisions, staging efficiency (time taken, test number, and costs) and per-organ sensitivity and specificity for metastases and per-patient agreement for local T and N stage. This trial is registered with the International Standard Randomised Controlled Trial registry, number ISRCTN50436483, and is complete.

Findings Between Feb 26, 2013, and Sept 5, 2016, 976 patients were screened for eligibility. 353 patients were recruited, 187 of whom completed the trial; 52 (28%) had metastasis at baseline. Pathway sensitivity was 50% (95% CI 37–63) for WB-MRI and 54% (41–67) for standard pathways, a difference of 4% (–7 to 15, $p=0.73$). No adverse events related to imaging were reported. Specificity did not differ between WB-MRI (93% [88–96]) and standard pathways (95% [91–98], $p=0.45$). Agreement with the multidisciplinary team's final treatment decision was 98% for WB-MRI and 99% for the standard pathway. Time to complete staging was shorter for WB-MRI (13 days [12–14]) than for the standard pathway (19 days [17–21]); a 6-day (4–8) difference. The number of tests required was similar WB-MRI (one [1–1]) and standard pathways (one [1–2]). Mean per-patient costs were £317 (273–361) for WB-MRI and £620 (574–666) for standard pathways.

Interpretation WB-MRI staging pathways have similar accuracy to standard pathways, and reduce the staging time and costs.

Funding UK National Institute for Health Research.

Copyright © 2019 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an Open Access article under the CC BY 4.0 license.

Introduction

Non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) is the leading cause of cancer related death in the UK, with more than 35 000 deaths annually.¹ Accurate staging is fundamental for optimal patient outcomes, particularly identification of metastatic disease, because this typically dictates

therapeutic strategy. At least 20% of patients who undergo curative lung surgery relapse with undiagnosed metastatic disease (so-called futile thoracotomy),² indicating that the current approach to NSCLC staging is suboptimal. Staging pathways are complex, relying on high technology imaging platforms such as CT, PET-CT, and MRI. In

Lancet Respir Med 2019;
7: 523–32

Published Online
May 9, 2019
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(19\)30090-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(19)30090-6)

See [Comment](#) page 471

*Members listed in the appendix (p 1)

Centre for Medical Imaging (Prof S A Taylor FRCP, E W Johnston FRCP, A Morton, A Oliver FRINA, Prof S Punwani FRCP, H S Sidhu FRCP, Prof S Halligan FMedSci), Cancer Research UK & UCL Cancer Trials Centre (S Beare PhD, M Duggan MSc, K Reczko BSc, J Teague BSc), Institute of Nuclear Medicine (Prof A M Groves FRCP), Lungs for Living Research Centre, UCL Respiratory (Prof S M Janes PhD, N Navani PhD), Research Department of Primary Care and Population Health (C S Clarke PhD), and Department of Applied Health Research (Prof S Morris PhD), University College London, London, UK; Institute of Applied Health Research, NIHR Birmingham Biomedical Research Centre, College of Medical and Dental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, UK (S Mallett DPhil, L Quinn MSc); Barking, Havering, and Redbridge NHS Trust, Romford, UK (S Ball MRCP, K Tarver FRCP); Frimley Park Hospital, Frimley, UK (G Bhatnagar FRCP); Department of Respiratory Medicine (A Bhowmik FRCP) and Department of Radiology (P Boavida FRCP), Homerton University Hospital, London, UK; UCL Cancer Institute, London, UK

(Prof J Bridgewater PhD);
Department of Radiology,
Barts Health NHS Trust,
London, UK (S Ellis FRCR,
A Hameeduddin FRCR); Mount
Vernon Centre for Cancer
Treatment, Mount Vernon
Hospital, Northwood, UK
(R Glynn-Jones FRCR);
Department of Cancer Imaging,
School of Biomedical
Engineering and Imaging
Sciences, King's College
London, King's Health Partners,
London, UK (Prof V Goh FRCR,
D Prezzi FRCR); Department of
Thoracic Medicine, University
College London Hospitals, UK
(Prof S M Janes, N Navani);
Department of Radiology,
Royal Marsden Hospital,
Sutton, Surrey, UK
(Prof D-M Koh FRCR);
Department of Respiratory
Medicine, Whittington
Hospital, London, UK
(S Lock FRCR); Department of
Psychological Sciences,
Birkbeck University of London,
London, UK (A Miles PhD);
Department of Respiratory
Medicine, Barts Health NHS
Trust, London, UK
(T O'Shaughnessy FRCP); Paul
Strickland Scanner Centre,
Mount Vernon Cancer Centre,
Northwood, UK
(Prof A R Padhani FRCR);
Department of Radiology,
Guy's & St Thomas' NHS
Foundation Trust, London, UK
(D Prezzi); Norfolk and Norwich
University Hospitals NHS
Foundation Trust, Norwich, UK
(H Rafiee FRCR); Department of
Imaging, Hammersmith
Hospital, Imperial College
Healthcare NHS Trust, London,
UK (Prof A G Rockall FRCR,
N Strickland FRCR); Department
of Cancer and Surgery, Imperial
College London, London, UK
(Prof A G Rockall); and
Department of Respiratory
Medicine, Princess Alexandra
Hospital NHS Trust, Harlow, UK
(P Russell PhD)

Correspondence to:
Prof Stuart A Taylor, Centre for
Medical Imaging, University
College London, London
W1W 7TS, UK
stuart.taylor@ucl.ac.uk
See Online for appendix

Research in context

Evidence before this study

The detection of metastatic disease during non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) staging underpins treatment strategy and is fundamental to optimisation of patient outcomes. Staging pathways rely on high technology imaging platforms such as CT, PET-CT, and MRI, which differ in their diagnostic accuracies across individual organs. Such multimodality staging pathways are complex, resource and time intensive, involve irradiation, and increase patient anxiety. Modern MRI platforms can image the whole body within 1 h, and whole-body MRI (WB-MRI) is advocated as a more accurate, efficient, and safer alternative to multimodality staging pathways. We searched PubMed and Embase (without language restriction) for articles published between Jan 1, 1990, and Sept 30, 2018, using MeSH and full-text search-strings for "cancer", "neoplasm", "staging", "diagnostic accuracy", "magnetic resonance imaging", "whole body imaging", "diffusion magnetic resonance imaging", "metastasis", and "lung". We found several meta-analyses reporting WB-MRI accuracy for lung cancer staging, most suggesting accuracy for metastatic disease is equivalent to, or might exceed standard technologies. All such meta-analyses, however, were limited to metastasis detection in specific end organs, notably bone. Various comparators have been selected but the majority compare WB-MRI with PET-CT, and scintigraphy (in the case of bone metastasis). Most primary studies were small, single site, and explanatory, with WB-MRI interpreted by a few specialised radiologists. They focused on single modality comparisons rather than evaluating real-world,

multimodality staging pathways. We found no data regarding how WB-MRI influences the first major treatment decision or staging efficiency.

Added value of this study

To our knowledge, this is the largest prospective multicentre trial to date comparing the diagnostic accuracy of WB-MRI staging pathways to standard staging in patients newly diagnosed with NSCLC. We used a pragmatic trial design to better test pathway performance in routine clinical practice and investigated staging pathway efficiency in terms of test number, time to completion, and costs. We also contemporaneously tested the effect of alternative staging pathways on the nature and timing of the first major treatment decisions. Patient outcomes were followed-up after 12 months to better evaluate pathway accuracy at the time of initial staging. We found both pathways had similar accuracies for identifying patients with metastatic disease and the nature of the first major treatment decision was similar. WB-MRI was more efficient and reduced the time to staging completion and costs.

Implications of all the available evidence

WB-MRI staging pathways have similar accuracy to current standard staging pathways, resulting in the same treatment decisions. However, they are more efficient and reduce time to complete staging and costs. WB-MRI is, therefore, more suitable for staging in routine clinical practice. Future research should investigate the utility of WB-MRI treatment response assessment and cancer surveillance after curative treatments.

England, for example, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) publishes guidelines that require multiple, sequential imaging tests to complete staging and allow the first treatment decisions to be made.^{3,4} The complexity of staging pathways is due to modalities having variable accuracies across organs at risk for harbouring metastases. Standard pathways are, therefore, time and resource intensive, irradiate patients,⁵ and increase anxiety if protracted.⁶

Modern MRI scanners can image the entire body within 1 h, and whole-body MRI (WB-MRI)—which typically scans from the head to mid-thigh—is a potentially more accurate and safer alternative to standard multimodality staging pathways. WB-MRI could also accelerate staging, thereby increasing efficiency by reducing additional tests, staging time, and costs. Meta-analyses suggest accuracy of WB-MRI in detecting metastatic disease for metastatic disease is equivalent to, or might exceed, standard technologies,^{7–18} but most reports combine disparate cancers^{7–9,11,12,14,15} or those considering lung cancer alone focus on metastasis detection in a single organ, typically bone.^{10,13,16–18} Primary studies of WB-MRI in lung cancer staging are predominantly small, single site, explanatory studies with WB-MRI interpretation by a few highly experienced radiologists, which is unlike real-world

pathways.⁴ Studies usually compare single modalities (eg, WB-MRI vs PET-CT) instead of the multiple staging tests encountered in daily practice.⁴ There are no data regarding how WB-MRI pathways influence staging times, additional tests, costs, or treatment decisions. As such, there is insufficient evidence to assess whether WB-MRI should be adopted.¹⁹

We did two parallel prospective multicentre trials to elucidate and directly compare the diagnostic accuracy and efficiency of WB-MRI-based staging pathways with standard staging in NSCLC (Streamline L) and colon cancer (Streamline C).²⁰ Here, we report findings from Streamline L.

Methods

Study design and participants

Streamline L is a multicentre, prospective trial comparing diagnostic accuracy for metastatic disease of staging pathways based on initial WB-MRI, with standard staging in NSCLC. Ethics committee approval was granted on Oct 3, 2012, and the trial was coordinated by Cancer Research UK and University College London Cancer Trials Centre, with oversight from an independent data monitoring committee and a trial steering committee. All patients gave written informed consent.

Patients were recruited from 16 general and teaching UK National Health Service (NHS) hospitals. Because 11 of the 16 sites did not have the infrastructure to do WB-MRI, these sites sent patients to a nearby hospital for scanning (appendix p 2). Eligible patients were aged 18 years or older with histologically proven or suspected NSCLC on chest CT, referred for staging. Suspicion of NSCLC was defined as an abnormality with CT characteristics sufficiently suggestive of NSCLC to indicate additional diagnostic and staging investigations. The disease had to be potentially radically treatable on the diagnostic CT chest, defined as stage IIIb or less (ie, T1–4, N0–2, and M0 by TNM 7th). Patients were ineligible if further workup was considered inappropriate by the clinical care team or patient. Histologies other than non-small-cell were ultimately excluded, but patients undergoing treatment based on clinically diagnosed NSCLC remained eligible. Patients were ineligible if they could not provide informed consent, had severe systemic disease making it undesirable to participate, were pregnant, or had contraindications to MRI.

Participants were identified from outpatient clinics, multidisciplinary team meetings, and inpatient wards by local research team, who took informed consent from consecutive, unselected, eligible patients. A screening log detailed all patients approached and reasons for non-participation, where applicable. Age, performance status, sex, and request date for the first staging investigation were collected from recruited patients. Staging completion date was also recorded, defined as the date of the final test in the standard staging pathway.

The protocol has been published⁴ and is available online.

Procedures

Participants had contemporaneous WB-MRI plus all standard staging investigations done as part of usual clinical care. Standard investigations were generally undertaken at the recruitment site, or a secondary hospital by referral in the case of specialised tests (such as PET-CT), and were interpreted by local consultant radiologists as per usual clinical practice. Interpretation of standard investigations was masked to WB-MRI images and findings. Case report forms included the nature and date of all standard investigations actually done before the first major treatment decision, and their findings regarding presence and location of metastatic disease.

The platform used for WB-MRI was in line with usual practice. A minimum dataset of sequences was acquired, including diffusion, T2-weighted, and T1-weighted (pre-intravenous and post-intravenous gadolinium contrast medium) imaging (appendix p 3). WB-MRI datasets were uploaded electronically to a secure central imaging server (3Dnet; Biotronics3D, London, UK) for interpretation, and were withheld initially from the local Picture

Archiving and Communications System to ensure local radiologists interpreting standard staging interventions were masked.

Across all recruitment sites and imaging hubs, 16 radiologists interpreted WB-MRI and were unaware of all other standard staging investigations and clinical information (other than the suspected cancer diagnosis and its lobar location). All radiologists were fellows of the Royal College of Radiologists and had interpreted at least 20 validated staging WB-MRIs. Radiologists with experience of fewer than 100 WB-MRI datasets initially had their reports validated by more experienced colleagues (ie, had worked on >100 WB-MRI datasets) and reported alone only once deemed competent by their colleague. This procedure was designed specifically to mirror how WB-MRI would be reported in NHS practice if more widely disseminated. Radiologists completed case report forms documenting the T and N stage of the local tumour,²¹ and the presence, location, and diameter of metastatic disease across various anatomical sites using six numerical confidence levels grouped subsequently into normal, equivocal, and abnormal. Radiologists interpreted WB-MRI as per their usual practice, considering known morphology and characteristics of metastatic disease across the various MRI sequences,²² and reproduced case report form findings in a free text clinical report, uploaded onto the 3Dnet software for subsequent release to the multidisciplinary team meeting. If additional tests were recommended for equivocal findings, this suggestion was included in their report.

Patients were discussed in the multi-disciplinary team meeting at their local hospital as per usual care pathways. WB-MRI images and reports were withheld until patients had completed all standard staging investigations so that the multidisciplinary team made its first major treatment decision based only on standard staging.⁴ The decision was documented (appendix p 4), along with the TNM stage assigned.

In the same meeting, the WB-MRI report and images were then shown to the multidisciplinary team via 3Dnet. The team considered the report and images and stated whether additional tests would have been requested before the first major treatment decision could be reached, had WB-MRI been the initial staging investigation (eg, to investigate equivocal findings). Any such tests were then done if they or an equivalent test had not already been done as part of the standard pathway and the multidisciplinary team considered them essential to patient care. If done already, their results were noted. The multidisciplinary team recorded the TNM stage based on the WB-MRI staging pathway (ie, WB-MRI plus the results of any additional tests generated, if any) and stated what the first major treatment decision would have been on the basis of this pathway. The final multidisciplinary team treatment decision was then made based on all available tests

For the protocol see <https://www.ctc.ucl.ac.uk/TrialDetails.aspx?Trial=90&TherA=7>

(ie, standard pathway, WB-MRI, and any additional tests; appendix p 4).

We devised a reference standard using multidisciplinary consensus panel review, a procedure that is standard for diagnostic test accuracy studies where an independent reference standard does not exist or is impossible because of incorporation bias.^{4,23} Patients were followed-up for 12 months (or until death, if sooner). Each recruitment site convened a series of panels to derive the reference standard TNM stage, consisting of at least two radiologists (one external to the site) with expertise in cross-sectional imaging and nuclear medicine, and at least one of the following: respiratory physician, thoracic surgeon, or oncologist. The panel had access to a histopathologist if required, and a member of the Cancer Research UK and University College London Cancer Trials Centre and trial management group attended to ensure the consensus process was uniform across the trial. The panel considered all available clinical data over the follow-up period, including images and results of all staging and follow-up investigations, surgical findings, histopathology (surgical resections and biopsies), and patients' clinical course, and assigned a TNM stage for the time of recruitment. The location and size of any metastatic deposits were recorded. In the absence of histological proof, metastatic disease was assumed if new lesions appeared during follow-up with suggestive imaging characteristics, or if compatible lesions that were already present either progressed or responded to therapy. Specific criteria were applied depending on length of follow up (in the case of death) and if the primary tumour remained in situ (appendix p 5). From all follow-up data, the panel assigned a retrospective optimal primary treatment decision, noting radiological perceptual errors in the initial interpretation of staging investigations (ie, unreported metastases that could be identified by the panel in retrospect, with full knowledge of all follow-up investigations).

Outcomes

The primary outcome was the difference in per-patient sensitivity for metastatic disease detection between standard and WB-MRI staging pathways, compared against the consensus reference standard. Prespecified outcomes were reported according to the diameter of the largest metastatic deposit (≥ 1 cm or < 1 cm) to assess the effect of lesion size on diagnostic accuracy, per-organ sensitivity, and for WB-MRI as a stand-alone investigation based on the original radiologist report.

Secondary outcomes were difference in per-patient specificity for metastatic disease detection between standard and WB-MRI staging pathways, agreement between treatment decisions based on alternate pathways and the multidisciplinary team and consensus panel treatment decisions, staging efficiency (time taken, test number, and costs), per-organ sensitivity and specificity for metastasis, and per-patient agreement for local T and

N stage. Additional secondary outcomes related to the effect of differing combinations of MRI sequences on accuracy, interobserver variability in WB-MRI interpretation, and the effect of adding WB-MRI to standard pathways will be reported elsewhere. The comparative patient experience of staging pathways and the findings of a discrete choice experiment have already been reported.^{24–26}

Statistical analysis

Using methods for comparative studies,²⁷ we estimated that 50 patients with metastasis occult on diagnostic CT chest would give 80% power to detect a sensitivity difference of 24% between WB-MRI (79%) and standard pathways (55%), assuming 25% metastatic prevalence, 53% concordance between pathways, and a 20% withdrawal rate at 1 year, giving a target sample size of 250 patients. On Dec 7, 2015, as recommended by the independent data monitoring committee, the target sample size was revised to 353 patients to ensure inclusion of about 50 patients with metastasis.

We report our prespecified primary and secondary outcomes, and additional sensitivity analyses. Binary comparisons (sensitivity, specificity, and treatment decision agreement) were calculated using paired proportions (population marginal) in STATA 14.2 (College Station, TX, USA). For the primary outcome, equivocal disease was considered positive for metastasis. Sensitivity analysis treated equivocal results as negative.

There were no missing data for the primary outcome. Statistical significance was determined on the basis of 95% CIs from Newcombe paired proportion method;²⁸ McNemar's test p values are reported. Pathway treatment decisions were grouped for analysis (see appendix p 6) and compared to the final decisions made by the multidisciplinary team and consensus panel (as a sensitivity analysis). Time to complete staging pathways (excluding initial diagnostic tests) was calculated in days, by adding times for staging tests (from request to performance) to median wait times for a treatment decision by the multidisciplinary team, calculated across all patients. In the case of missing data, median times from the same or similar tests were used. The median difference in time and number of staging tests between pathways was compared for each patient with 95% CI from 2.5 and 97.5 centiles of 1999 bootstrap samples, with replacement used to compare between standard and WB-MRI staging pathways. Descriptive analysis of time to complete staging are reported in median days with IQR for staging pathways.

We compared the costs of WB-MRI versus standard pathways (appendix p 7). The cost analysis was based on a UK NHS perspective. Costs were calculated in pounds sterling (as of 2016–17) and were inflated as necessary. The time horizon was the time from initial diagnosis to treatment decision by the multidisciplinary team. Given the time horizon, which was less than 1 year, discounting

was not applied. We calculated the mean cost per patient of tests received when undergoing standard imaging pathways only and WB-MRI (including additional staging tests ordered after the WB-MRI). We only included the cost of the tests received; the costs of the multidisciplinary team were not included because this cost was incurred irrespective of the type of staging test received. We did not include any adverse events related to imaging because no such events were reported. Unit costs were taken from 2016–17 NHS reference costs.²⁹ Decisions about which reference costs to use were made with appropriate clinical input (appendix pp 8–9). Mean per-patient staging costs for standard pathways and WB-MRI were compared using 95% CI derived from 1000 bootstrapped replications of the mean with replacement.

Streamline L is registered with the International Standard Randomised Controlled Trial registry, number ISRCTN50436483.




Figure 1: Trial profile

NSCLC=non-small-cell lung cancer. WB-MRI=whole-body MRI.

Role of the funding source

The funder of the study stipulated that the study design should be a diagnostic accuracy trial using a cohort design, but was not involved in data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report. The corresponding author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Results

Between Feb 26, 2013, and Sept 5, 2016, 976 patients were screened for eligibility (figure 1). 353 patients were recruited, of whom 166 were excluded, mainly owing to a final diagnosis other than lung cancer (figure 1). The final cohort of 187 patients had a median age of 67 years (IQR 61–75) and 70 (37%) were women (figure 1, table 1). According to the consensus reference standard, 137 (73%) patients were stage T2 or above, 77 (41%) were node-positive (appendix p 10), and 52 (28%) had metastatic disease at the time of staging (appendix p 11), meeting sample size stipulations. In eight patients with metastatic disease at the time of staging (according to protocol definitions, appendix p 5), metastasis only became apparent during follow-up

	Value
Sex	
Male	117 (63%)
Female	70 (37%)
Age, years	
Median (IQR)	67 (61–75)
Range	37–96
Performance status	
Fully active	86 (46%)
Ambulatory	
Able to work	75 (40%)
Not able to work	8 (4%)
Not recorded	18 (10%)
Tumour location*	
Right upper lobe	73 (39%)
Right middle lobe	14 (7%)
Right lower lobe	24 (13%)
Left upper lobe†	54 (29%)
Left lower lobe	28 (15%)
Histological subtype	
Adenocarcinoma	115 (62%)
Large cell	4 (2%)
Squamous	42 (22%)
Adenosquamous	1 (1%)
Other	13 (7%)
No histology or missing	12 (6%)

Data are n (%) unless otherwise stated. *By consensus reference standard. Some patients have multiple tumour locations. †Including the lingula.

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of final trial cohort




Figure 2: WB-MRI and standard staging pathways sensitivity and specificity for patients with metastatic disease against the consensus reference standard. WB-MRI=whole-body MRI.

	Patients with metastatic disease*	Sensitivity				Patients without metastatic disease*	Specificity			
		WB-MRI staging pathway†	Standard staging pathway	Difference	p value		WB-MRI staging pathway†	Standard staging pathway	Difference	p value
Diagnostic accuracy	52	50% (37 to 63)	54% (41 to 67)	-4% (-15 to 7)	p=0.73	135	93% (88 to 96)	95% (91 to 98)	-2% (-7 to 2)	p=0.45
Equivocal lesions considered negative	52	48% (35 to 61)	46% (33 to 59)	2% (-11 to 14)	..	135	94% (89 to 97)	97% (93 to 99)	-3% (-6 to 1)	..

Data are n or % (95% CI). *Patients by consensus reference standard. †WB-MRI plus additional generated tests.

Table 2: Per-patient sensitivity and specificity for metastatic disease

and was not visible on initial staging investigations, even in retrospect.

Sensitivity of staging for patients with metastatic disease was 50% (95% CI 37–63) for WB-MRI and 54% (41–67) for standard pathways, a difference of 4% (–7 to 15, $p=0.73$; figure 2, table 2). For the primary outcome, there were seven perceptual errors in the WB-MRI pathway and three in the standard pathway. No adverse events (serious or non-serious) were reported during the trial.

Specificity did not differ between the WB-MRI pathway (93% [88–96]) and standard pathway (95% [91–98], $p=0.45$). The number of equivocal results per pathway is shown in the appendix (p 12). Sensitivity analysis found no differences between pathways when lesions reported as equivocal were treated as either all positive or all negative (table 2), or across individual organ sites (appendix p 13). The WB-MRI pathway had 82% (64–92) sensitivity for patients whose largest metastasis was at least 1 cm, which did not differ from standard pathways (75% [57–87]); for those with metastasis smaller than 1 cm, sensitivity was 9% (3–28; appendix p 14). As a stand-alone investigation (ie, without additional tests generated), WB-MRI had a similar sensitivity to that of the standard pathway, but had lower specificity than the standard pathway (appendix p 15).

The WB-MRI pathway had 65% agreement for N stage compared with 75% for the standard pathway, a significant difference of 10% (3–18; appendix p 16). Of the 187 patients, 109 had histological proof of N stage, usually via endobronchial ultrasound nodal sampling or surgery, or both. In these patients, there remained a difference in agreement of 10% (1–19) between WB-MRI and standard pathways (appendix p 17). Pathways did not

significantly differ in terms of agreement for T stage (appendix p 18).

Agreement with the final treatment decision of the multidisciplinary team was 98% for WB-MRI and 99% for the standard pathway (table 3). Treatment decisions based on WB-MRI and standard pathways had similar levels of agreement with the retrospective consensus panel optimal treatment decision (appendix p 19).

Across the cohort, standard staging pathways involved 302 individual investigations and WB-MRI involved 232 individual investigations; WB-MRI pathways generated an additional 45 tests (appendix pp 20–21). The median number of tests did not differ between the WB-MRI (one [1 to 1]) and standard (one [1 to 2]) pathways (difference 0 [–1 to 0]; appendix p 22).

Time to staging was shorter for WB-MRI pathways than for standard pathways (13 days [12–14] vs 19 days [17–21]); a difference of 6 days (4–8) (figure 3, appendix pp 23–24). Mean per-patient costs for the WB MRI pathway (£317 [273–361]) were lower than for the standard staging pathway (£620 [574–666]; appendix p 25).

Discussion

To date, Streamline L is the largest prospective multi-centre trial to compare the diagnostic accuracy of WB-MRI and standard staging pathways for metastatic disease in patients with newly diagnosed NSCLC. Both pathways showed similar accuracy, but the WB-MRI pathway was more time-efficient and cost-efficient. Treatment decisions were similar. Our data suggest WB-MRI is a viable replacement for standard pathways.

WB-MRI pathways had no advantage over standard pathways in terms of diagnostic accuracy. The overall

sensitivity of both pathways for metastatic disease was lower than published studies^{10,13} suggest, although 2018 data³⁰ challenges the accuracy of standard staging pathways. We excluded patients with locally advanced or metastatic disease on their diagnostic CT chest (including the lower neck, liver, and adrenal glands) because these patients generally undergo treatment without curative intent. Such exclusion is unusual in the literature. Metastases were therefore either occult or involved remote sites. Eight patients developed their first metastasis during follow-up which were not visible in retrospect on any staging examination. The concept of occult metastatic disease is well established: 35% of patients develop metastatic disease post thoracotomy despite a negative staging PET-CT.³¹ The number of perceptual errors was low, and many retrospectively visible lesions were subtle and difficult to detect prospectively. As a pragmatic trial, Streamline L provides the best estimate of NSCLC staging accuracy in routine clinical practice.

We found that the WB-MRI pathway had 82% sensitivity for patients with metastatic disease of at least 1 cm, compared with only 9% for smaller metastasis. Our WB-MRI protocol complied with accepted international standards,³² including diffusion weighted imaging and post-gadolinium sequences; however, by necessity, had to compromise—for example, on slice thickness—to ensure reasonable total scan times. The previous largest study of WB-MRI was a single site comparison with PET-CT alone,²² which reported WB-MRI had a per-patient sensitivity of 70% and specificity of 92%, compared with 63% and 95% for PET CT, respectively. However, unlike Streamline L, imaging interpretation was done via the consensus of two experienced readers, and complete staging pathways were not evaluated. The effect on treatment decisions was not considered.

We found WB-MRI pathways had similar accuracy for T staging compared with standard pathways, suggesting the anatomical information given by WB-MRI matched that of standard imaging. Sensitivities for N stage were comparable to that previously reported,^{17,18} but standard pathways were superior overall and in those with histological proof of N stage. It is widely accepted that invasive nodal staging with endobronchial ultrasound (and EUS where available) is superior to imaging techniques for detecting nodal metastases³³ and current guidelines recommend sampling of enlarged mediastinal nodes if it would affect patient management.³⁴ We specifically investigated implementation of WB-MRI after diagnostic CT, which was therefore also available for lymph node size measurement as part of the clinical decision making for this pathway. The 2019 NICE guidelines³⁵ recommend a systematic approach to staging hilar and mediastinal nodes with increased use of endobronchial ultrasound-guided sampling. Endobronchial ultrasound was available to all Streamline L recruitment sites as part of patient diagnostic and staging

	n*	WB-MRI staging pathway†		Standard staging pathway		Difference agreement, % (95% CI)
		Agreement	Disagreement	Agreement	Disagreement	
All patients	183	180 (98%)	3 (2%)	181 (99%)	2 (1%)	-1% (-4 to 2)
Patients with metastatic disease	52	51 (98%)	1 (2%)	50 (96%)	2 (4%)	2% (-7 to 11)
Patients without metastatic disease	131	129 (98%)	2 (2%)	131 (100%)	0	-2% (-4 to 1)

Data are n (%) unless otherwise stated. *Four patients were missing at least one type of patient treatment decision. †WB-MRI plus additional generated tests.

Table 3: Agreement between pathway and multidisciplinary team treatment decisions




Figure 3: Time taken for staging pathways
WB-MRI=whole-body MRI.

workup. The lower sensitivity of WB-MRI for nodal staging will likely be offset by the current invasive approach to N staging if status affects treatment decisions. Furthermore, nodal stage alone does not dictate treatment; for example, patients staged N0, N1, and, in some cases, N2 disease are still candidates for surgery, and patients with metastatic disease are treated accordingly, regardless of nodal stage. In support, the lower sensitivity of the WB-MRI pathway did not negatively affect treatment decisions. Agreement with both the final multidisciplinary team treatment decision and the optimal retrospective treatment decision was similar for both staging pathways, suggesting that WB-MRI could replace standard pathways without patient detriment.

Generally, efficiency receives less attention than diagnostic accuracy.¹⁹ Timeliness of lung cancer treatment is a care quality indicator; reducing time to treatment decisions by 2 weeks is associated with improved survival³³ and prolonged pathways increase patient anxiety.⁶ Streamline L found that WB-MRI pathways were more efficient than standard pathways, reducing the time to complete staging significantly and decreased average per-patient staging costs by £303, largely due to PET-CT use by standard pathways.

Efficiency of WB-MRI pathways could potentially increase given the growth of routine cranial imaging in staging, and the emphasis on oligometastatic (M1b) disease detection in the eighth edition of TNM. On average, the generation of additional tests to the WB-MRI pathway added 4–5 days to the pathway staging time. Although MRI access is restricted in many health-care settings, our data suggest that increased provision would ultimately reduce the cost and complexity of staging NSCLC. Although patients report that having WB-MRI is a greater burden than standard imaging,²⁴ a discrete choice experiment²⁶ done as part of the trial shows patients generally prefer WB-MRI staging to standard pathways if they reduce staging times and radiation exposure as found in Streamline L.

A strength of our trial is its pragmatic design. We recruited from a representative range of general and teaching hospitals, with all imaging done and interpreted according to usual local protocols, to increase generalisability of our results. The 16 radiologists interpreting WB-MRI were representative of those who would do so in daily NHS practice. We avoided using a smaller number of highly experienced radiologists; although we acknowledge that such individuals might achieve sensitivities greater than we report, they do not represent the national workforce. We used multidisciplinary team meetings to mirror patient care in the NHS. In doing so, we captured the entirety of standard pathways, including contemporaneous treatment decisions. We used a novel cloud-based image repository to maintain blinding and control multidisciplinary team access to WB-MRI until the appropriate time in the decision-making process. We were able to model the content and timing of WB-MRI staging pathways, and the potential effect on decision making. Conversely, previous research usually reports head-to-head comparisons between single imaging platforms, failing to capture pathway complexity. To our knowledge, our trial design is unique.

Streamline L does have limitations. Our withdrawal rate was superficially high, but most excluded participants were excluded because of a final diagnosis other than NSCLC. We masked radiologists reporting WB-MRI to patient history and contemporaneous imaging. This was masked to isolate diagnostic test accuracy within a pragmatic setting. Participants were representative of those undergoing staging in daily practice, although we did exclude pregnant women, patients not wanting to undergo WB-MRI, and patients with contraindications to MRI. We modelled timing of WB-MRI staging pathways on the basis of real waiting times collated from recruitment sites during the trial, although sites had capacity to do WB-MRI. Waiting times might not be representative of those at other hospitals, and in other countries. Some of the benefits of reduced staging time by WB-MRI pathways could be negated if time to commencing treatment (eg, surgical resection) are not reduced in parallel. Treatment decisions based on WB-MRI pathways were

made after the multidisciplinary team was unmasked to all standard imaging tests, which could introduce bias. However, this situation was unavoidable if the full complexity of standard staging pathways was to be captured without interference from WB-MRI findings and if treatment decisions were to be recorded contemporaneously. Furthermore, alternate pathway agreement with a retrospective optimal treatment at 12 months remained very similar. Our cost analyses reflect an English NHS perspective and could differ in other settings, which might negate some of the cost advantages of WB-MRI pathways. Although WB-MRI is advocated as being safer than current standard staging investigations, new technologies are reducing radiation dose,³⁶ and there are current uncertainties about the neuronal deposition of gadolinium.³⁷ Further research is needed to define the potential use of WB-MRI in the assessment of treatment response and post-therapy surveillance for recurrent disease. Our findings are specific for NSCLC and might not be relevant to other primary tumour sites.

In summary, WB-MRI staging pathways have similar diagnostic accuracy to standard pathways for identifying patients with metastatic disease in newly diagnosed NSCLC, and lead to similar treatment decisions. However, they reduce staging time and costs. In a real-world NHS setting, WB-MRI-based pathways are a viable replacement for standard pathways.

Contributors

SAT, AGR, JB, RG-J, VG, D-MK, SMJ, NN, SMa, and SP did the literature search, collected data, did the clinical studies, and recruited patients. SBe, MD, JT, and KR collected data. SAT, SMa, AMi, SMo, LQ, and SH designed the trial and interpreted data. SBa, GB, AB, AP, PB, SE, AMG, AH, EWJ, SL, ToS, DP, HR, PR, NS, KT, and HSS did the clinical studies and recruited patients. LQ, SMa, CSC, and SMo designed and did the statistical and economic analysis. AO and AMo acted as patient representatives. SAT, SMa, and SH wrote the initial manuscript draft. SAT is the study guarantor. All authors contributed to the conception or design of the trial, drafted or revised the manuscript, agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work, and gave final approval of the version to be published.

Declaration of interests

SAT, SMa, SBe, JB, RGJ, VG, AMG, SMJ, DMK, AM, SMo, AMo, AMi, NN, AO, ARP, SP, ARG, and SH report grants from UK National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). SAT and SH are NIHR senior investigators. SMJ is a Wellcome Trust Senior Clinical Fellow. SAT reports consultancy fees from Robarts Plc. AGR reports personal fees from Guerbet. VG reports grants from Siemens. ARP reports research agreements with Siemens. All other authors declare no competing interests.

Data sharing

Individual participant data that underlie the results reported in this article, after deidentification (text, tables, figures, and appendices), will be available for individual participant data meta-analysis beginning 9 months and ending 36 months after article publication. Data will be available to investigators whose proposed use of the data has been approved by an independent review committee (learned intermediary) identified for this purpose. Data access requires proof of relevant ethical committee approval for the specified analysis only. Data will be limited to those required for a specific analysis to protect deanonymisation. Where proposals that would compete with ongoing or planned research from the investigators within the trials team, data access will only be granted once investigator team publications are submitted. Proposals should be directed to the corresponding author; to gain access, data requestors will need to sign a data access

agreement. After 36 months, there is no funded technical support. Information regarding submitting proposals and accessing data can be obtained by emailing ctc.enquiries@ucl.ac.uk

Acknowledgments

This project was funded by the NIHR health technology assessment programme (project number 10/68/01) and will be published in full in Health Technology Assessment. The project is supported by researchers at the NIHR University College London Hospitals Biomedical Research Centre and NIHR Birmingham Biomedical Research Centre at the University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust and the University of Birmingham. This report presents independent research commissioned by the NIHR. The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, the NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, the HTA programme, or the Department of Health. The views and opinions expressed by the interviewees in this publication are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, MRC, CCF, NETSCC or the HTA programme or the Department of Health. The trial steering committee and independent data monitoring committee met at least annually. The trial steering committee included Nick Reed (chair), Andrew Clamp (subject expert), Fergus Macbeth (subject expert), Richard Stephens (subject expert), Damian Tolan (subject expert), and Moira Heath (public representative), and the independent data monitoring committee included Stuart Williams (chair), Richard Adams (subject expert), Caroline Kelly (statistician), and Peter Schmid (subject expert). We acknowledge the support given by Biotronics3D during the conduct of the trial.

References

- 1 Cancer Research UK. Statistics by cancer type. <http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/statistics-by-cancer-type> (accessed June 1, 2018).
- 2 Gilligan D, Nicolson M, Smith I, et al. Preoperative chemotherapy in patients with resectable non-small cell lung cancer: results of the MRC LU22/NVALT 2/EORTC 08012 multicentre randomised trial and update of systematic review. *Lancet* 2007; **369**: 1929–37.
- 3 National Institute for Health Care and Excellence. Lung cancer: diagnosis and management. 2011. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg121> (accessed Sept 1, 2018).
- 4 Taylor SA, Mallett S, Miles A, et al. Streamlining staging of lung and colorectal cancer with whole body MRI: study protocols for two multicentre, non-randomised, single-arm, prospective diagnostic accuracy studies (Streamline C and Streamline L). *BMC Cancer* 2017; **17**: 299.
- 5 Shah DJ, Sachs RK, Wilson DJ. Radiation-induced cancer: a modern view. *Br J Radiol* 2012; **85**: e1166–73.
- 6 Brocken P, Prins JB, Dekhuijzen PN, van der Heijden HF. The faster the better? A systematic review on distress in the diagnostic phase of suspected cancer, and the influence of rapid diagnostic pathways. *Psychooncology* 2012; **21**: 1–10.
- 7 Xu GZ, Li CY, Zhao L, He ZY. Comparison of FDG whole-body PET/CT and gadolinium-enhanced whole-body MRI for distant malignancies in patients with malignant tumors: a meta-analysis. *Ann Oncol* 2013; **24**: 96–101.
- 8 Duo J, Han X, Zhang L, Wang G, Ma Y, Yang Y. Comparison of FDG PET/CT and gadolinium-enhanced MRI for the detection of bone metastases in patients with cancer: a meta-analysis. *Clin Nucl Med* 2013; **38**: 343–48.
- 9 Li B, Li Q, Nie W, Liu S. Diagnostic value of whole-body diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging for detection of primary and metastatic malignancies: a meta-analysis. *Eur J Radiol* 2014; **83**: 338–44.
- 10 Liu T, Xu JY, Xu W, Bai YR, Yan WL, Yang HL. Fluorine-18 deoxyglucose positron emission tomography, magnetic resonance imaging and bone scintigraphy for the diagnosis of bone metastases in patients with lung cancer: which one is the best? A meta-analysis. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)* 2011; **23**: 350–58.
- 11 Wu LM, Gu HY, Zheng J, et al. Diagnostic value of whole-body magnetic resonance imaging for bone metastases: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2011; **34**: 128–35.
- 12 Yang HL, Liu T, Wang XM, Xu Y, Deng SM. Diagnosis of bone metastases: a meta-analysis comparing ¹⁸F-FDG PET, CT, MRI and bone scintigraphy. *Eur Radiol* 2011; **21**: 2604–17.
- 13 Qu X, Huang X, Yan W, Wu L, Dai K. A meta-analysis of ¹⁸F-FDG-PET-CT, ¹⁸F-FDG-PET, MRI and bone scintigraphy for diagnosis of bone metastases in patients with lung cancer. *Eur J Radiol* 2012; **81**: 1007–15.
- 14 Wu Q, Yang R, Zhou F, Hu Y. Comparison of whole-body MRI and skeletal scintigraphy for detection of bone metastatic tumors: a meta-analysis. *Surg Oncol* 2013; **22**: 261–66.
- 15 Smets AM, Deurloo EE, Slager TJE, Stoker J, Bipat S. Whole-body magnetic resonance imaging for detection of skeletal metastases in children and young people with primary solid tumors—systematic review. *Pediatr Radiol* 2018; **48**: 241–52.
- 16 Peerlings J, Troost EG, Nelemans PJ, et al. The diagnostic value of MR imaging in determining the lymph node status of patients with non-small cell lung cancer: a meta-analysis. *Radiology* 2016; **281**: 86–98.
- 17 Shen G, Hu S, Deng H, Kuang A. Performance of DWI in the nodal characterization and assessment of lung cancer: a meta-analysis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2016; **206**: 283–90.
- 18 Wu LM, Xu JR, Gu HY, et al. Preoperative mediastinal and hilar nodal staging with diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging and fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography/computed tomography in patients with non-small-cell lung cancer: which is better? *J Surg Res* 2012; **178**: 304–14.
- 19 Ferrante di Ruffano L, Hyde CJ, McCaffery KJ, Bossuyt PM, Deeks JJ. Assessing the value of diagnostic tests: a framework for designing and evaluating trials. *BMJ* 2012; **344**: e686.
- 20 Taylor SA, Mallett S, Beare S, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of whole-body MRI versus standard imaging pathways for metastatic disease in newly diagnosed colorectal cancer: the prospective Streamline C trial. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2019; published online May 9. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253\(19\)30056-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253(19)30056-1).
- 21 Edge SB, Byrd DR, Compton CC, Fritz AG, Greene FL, Trotti A, eds. AJCC cancer staging manual. 7th edn. New York, NY: Springer; 2010.
- 22 Ohno Y, Koyama H, Onishi Y, et al. Non-small cell lung cancer: whole-body MR examination for M-stage assessment—utility for whole-body diffusion-weighted imaging compared with integrated FDG PET/CT. *Radiology* 2008; **248**: 643–54.
- 23 Rutjes AW, Reitsma JB, Coomarasamy A, Khan KS, Bossuyt PM. Evaluation of diagnostic tests when there is no gold standard. A review of methods. *Health Technol Assess* 2007; **11**: 50.
- 24 Evans RE, Taylor SA, Beare S, et al. Perceived patient burden and acceptability of whole body MRI for staging lung and colorectal cancer: comparison with standard staging investigations. *Br J Radiol* 2018; **91**: 20170731.
- 25 Evans R, Taylor S, Janes S, et al. Patient experience and perceived acceptability of whole-body magnetic resonance imaging for staging colorectal and lung cancer compared with current staging scans: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open* 2017; **7**: e016391.
- 26 Miles A, Taylor SA, Evans REC, et al. Patient preferences for whole-body MRI or conventional staging pathways in lung and colorectal cancer: a discrete choice experiment. *Eur Radiol* 2019; published online April 1. DOI:10.1007/s00330-019-06153-4.
- 27 Alonzo TA, Pepe MS, Moskowitz CS. Sample size calculations for comparative studies of medical tests for detecting presence of disease. *Stat Med* 2002; **21**: 835–52.
- 28 Newcombe RG. Improved confidence intervals for the difference between binomial proportions based on paired data. *Stat Med* 1998; **17**: 2635–50.
- 29 NHS Improvement. National schedule of reference costs 2016/17. Nov 24, 2017. <https://improvement.nhs.uk/resources/reference-costs/> (accessed Sept 1, 2018).
- 30 Navani N, Fisher D, Tierney JF, Stephens RJ, Burdett S; NSCLC Meta-analysis Collaborative Group. The accuracy of clinical staging of stage I–IIa non-small cell lung cancer: an analysis based on individual participant data. *Chest* 2019; **155**: 502–09.
- 31 Fischer B, Lassen U, Mortensen J, et al. Preoperative staging of lung cancer with combined PET-CT. *N Engl J Med* 2009; **361**: 32–39.
- 32 Padhani AR, Lecouvet FE, Tunariu N, et al. Metastasis reporting and data system for prostate cancer: practical guidelines for acquisition, interpretation, and reporting of whole-body magnetic resonance imaging-based evaluations of multiorgan involvement in advanced prostate cancer. *Eur Urol* 2017; **71**: 81–92.

- 33 Navani N, Nankivell M, Lawrence DR, et al. Lung cancer diagnosis and staging with endobronchial ultrasound-guided transbronchial needle aspiration compared with conventional approaches: an open-label, pragmatic, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2015; **3**: 282–89.
- 34 Silvestri GA, Gonzalez AV, Jantz MA, et al. Methods for staging non-small cell lung cancer: Diagnosis and management of lung cancer, 3rd ed: American College of Chest Physicians evidence-based clinical practice guidelines. *Chest* 2013; **143**: e211S–50.
- 35 Maconachie R, Mercer T, Navani N, McVeigh G; Guideline Committee. Lung cancer: diagnosis and management: summary of updated NICE guidance. *BMJ* 2019; **364**: l1049.
- 36 Kubo T. Vendor free basics of radiation dose reduction techniques for CT. *Eur J Radiol* 2019; **110**: 14–21.
- 37 Olchowcy C, Cebulski K, Lasecki M, et al. The presence of the gadolinium-based contrast agent depositions in the brain and symptoms of gadolinium neurotoxicity—a systematic review. *PLoS One* 2017; **12**: e0171704.